



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,397	01/26/2001	Karlheinz Drauz	201554US0X	4705

22850 7590 09/02/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KIM, SUN U

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1723

13

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/769,397	DRAUZ ET AL.
	Examiner John Kim	Art Unit 1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

1. Claims 9-23 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 8.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The International Journal of Artificial Organs, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1978, pages 112-113 (hereinafter referred to as Quarto di Palo et al) in view of the admitted prior art (see Table 5 on pages 9-10 of the specification). Quarto de Palo et al teach that amino acids were added to the dialysis solution in a concentration equal to that of normal plasma and treating patients with above concentrations of amino acids in normal plasma resulted in prevention of amino acid loss during hemodialysis, restoration of the pathologically decreased values and removal of the amino acids present in blood in increased concentrations (see page 112). Furthermore, Quarto de Palo et al teach that administering amino acids in the right proportions and at the most favorable time i.e. during dialysis, they expected a greater utilization of amino acids for protein synthesis than for energy purpose (see page 112). Claims 1-8 essentially differ from the dialyzer fluid comprising the claimed amino acid concentrations in its claimed proportions. Specification teaches that the amino acid concentrations occurring in the plasma of a healthy person are set forth in Table 5 of the pages 9-10 of the specification which are within the claimed amino acid concentrations in a dialyzer fluid as claimed in claims 7-8. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dialyzer fluid of Quarto di Palo et al to arrive at the claimed proportions of amino acids in the dialyzer fluid with known information of the amino acid concentrations occurring in the plasma of a healthy person to provide the improved advantages in prevention of

amino acid loss during hemodialysis, restoration of the pathologically decreased values and removal of the amino acids present in blood in increased concentrations.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321[®] may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 20 of copending Application No. 09/399,743. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed compositions in the instant application encompass the claimed compositions in application no. 09/399,743.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 6/17/03 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-8 based upon Quarto di Palo et al as set forth in the last Office action because: Declaration accompanies foreign journal articles i.e. infusionstherapie, 11, 12-15 (1984) and Anaesthesia, 33, 11-19 (1984) which require English translated copies to give the declaration full consideration.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/17/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the dialysis fluid of Quarto di Palo et al are missing five of the amino acid components of the claimed composition i.e. Gln, Tyr, Cys, Asn and Cit and there is no suggestion to add these amino acids to the dialyzer fluid therein. However, adding the missing amino acids would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art with known information of the amino acid concentrations occurring in the plasma of a healthy person to provide the improved advantages in prevention of amino acid loss during hemodialysis, restoration of the pathologically decreased values and removal of the amino acids present in blood in increased concentrations as suggested by Quarto di Palo et al.

7. This application contains claims 9-23 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 2. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-2350. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached on (703) 308-0457. The fax phone number for official response is (703) 872-9306.

When sending a draft amendment by fax, please mark the paper as "DRAFT"; otherwise, mark the paper "OFFICIAL". This will expedite the processing of the paper.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.


John Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

J. Kim
August 28, 2003